

1107706965

MAIN

DS
126
147
NO. 1

CHARGE #

110-542300-7

THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF TEXAS
AT
AUSTIN



PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Papers on Palestine

A COLLECTION OF STATEMENTS,
ARTICLES AND LETTERS DEALING WITH
THE PALESTINE PROBLEM

Issued by
The Institute of Arab American Affairs, Inc.
160 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

1945

Papers on Palestine

A COLLECTION OF STATEMENTS,
ARTICLES AND LETTERS DEALING WITH
THE PALESTINE PROBLEM

Issued by
The Institute of Arab American Affairs, Inc.
160 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

1945

BINDERY.

OCT 21 1975

PREFACE

ONE of the tragic legacies of the last war is the problem of Palestine. That country, revered by Christians, Moslems and Jews alike, has fallen prey to political machinations. The land of the prophets who preached peace on earth and love for fellowmen has enjoyed no peace for the last quarter of a century. Its inhabitants, who are mainly Arabicized descendants of the old Semitic stock and are peace-loving, law-abiding folks, have been the victims of power politics and inimical propaganda. Their only "crime" is that they hold tenaciously to their land and culture and resist an alien invasion that would deprive them of their elemental rights and their chance for a healthy and progressive development. Yet very little is known about their legitimate hopes and aspirations, they having no spokesmen, no poets to sing their song, while a huge mass of literature put out by the highly financed and internationally organized Zionist movement attempts to discredit them and their brethren in the surrounding countries. Even the ordinary channels of communication, including radio, press and pulpit, are usually denied them.

The Institute of Arab American Affairs, Inc., whose aim is to encourage friendship and promote understanding between the United States and the Arabic-speaking peoples, deems it a public duty to publish the following papers dealing with the problem of Palestine, with the hope that the reader might be able to formulate a more intelligent opinion about it.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Testimony of Professor Philip K. Hitti before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives	1
II. Testimony of Mr. Faris S. Malouf before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives	6
III. Testimony of Mr. K. S. Twitchell before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives	13
IV. Palestinian Arabs Descended from Natives before Abraham by Professor Philip K. Hitti	16
V. Arab Nationalism and Political Zionism by Professor William Ernest Hocking	21
VI. The Voice of the Arabs by Professor Jabir Shibli	29
VII. The Palestine Mandate by Sir John Hope Simpson	33
VIII. A Letter by the Honorable J. W. Bailey to Greensboro Committee for the Abrogation of the White Paper	44
IX. A Letter by Professor Roger H. Soltan. Written in Reply to One Which Appeared in the <i>New York Times</i>	47
X. A Letter by Professor Philip Marshall Brown to the <i>New York Herald Tribune</i>	50
XI. A Letter by Professor Stuart C. Dodd to the <i>New York Herald Tribune</i>	52
Additional Readings on Palestine	54

THE following three testimonies were given at the hearings held February 15 and 16, 1944, before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, on a proposed resolution that reads:

"Whereas the Sixty-seventh Congress of the United States on June 30, 1922, unanimously resolved 'that the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of Christian and all other non-Jewish communities in Palestine, and that the holy places and religious buildings and sites in Palestine shall be adequately protected'; and

"Whereas the ruthless persecution of the Jewish people in Europe has clearly demonstrated the need of a Jewish homeland as a haven for the large numbers who have become homeless as a result of this persecution: Therefore be it *Resolved*, That the United States shall use its good offices and take appropriate measures to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for the free entry of Jews into that country, and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization, so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth."

This resolution was shelved by Congress following representations made by the Chief of Staff, the War Department and the Department of State.

I

TESTIMONY OF PHILIP K. HITTI

PROFESSOR OF SEMITIC LITERATURE, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

BEFORE

THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ON

RESOLUTIONS RELATIVE TO THE JEWISH NATIONAL HOME
IN PALESTINE

FEBRUARY 15, 1944

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Committee:

From the Arab point of view political Zionism is an exotic movement, internationally financed, artificially stimulated and holds no hope of ultimate or permanent success. Not only to the fifty million Arabs, many of whom are descendants of the Canaanites who were in the land long before the Hebrews entered Palestine under Joshua, but to the entire Moslem society, of whom the Arabs form the spearhead, a sovereign Jewish state in Palestine appears as an anachronism. These Moslems constitute a somewhat self-conscious society of about 275,000,000, who dominate a large portion of Africa and Asia. Even if the Zionist political program, supported by British and American diplomacy and bayonets, should someday become a reality, what chance of survival has such an alien state amidst a camp of a would-be hostile Arabic and unsympathetic Islamic world? There was a time in which a foreign state, a Latin one, was established in the Holy Land, but its memory lives today only in books on the Crusades.

For, be it remembered, on no other issue did the Moslems in modern times seem to manifest such a unanimity. Even on the question of the restoration of the caliphate, after it was destroyed by Mustafa Kamal in 1924, there has been more friction and less solidarity, as evidenced by the proceedings of the Islamic congresses held in Cairo and Mecca. Verbal protests against the Zionist political program, which this resolution adopts, and cash to fight its provisions have poured in the last two decades from Morocco to Malay. In India a "Palestine day" was celebrated in 1936 and the All India Moslem League passed a resolution at

its annual session on October 18, 1939, and another in its April meeting of 1943 warning the British against converting Palestine into a Jewish state. Jerusalem in Moslem eyes is the third *haram*, the third holy city after Mecca and Medina. It was the first *qiblah*, the first direction in which the early Moslems prayed before they began to turn in prayer toward Mecca. The land was given by Allah as a result of a *jihad* (holy war) and therefore for the Moslems to relinquish their claim on it constitutes a betrayal of their faith. It is even more sacred to the Christians, of whom there are some 130,000 in Palestine.

This uncompromising, persistent opposition to political Zionism, whose cause the resolution espoused, does not spell anti-Semitism. Of all the major peoples of the world, the Arabs perhaps come nearest to being free from race prejudice. Besides, they, like the Jews, are Semites, and they know it. They also know that their two religions are closest of kin, closer than either of them is to Christianity. Nowhere throughout medieval and modern times were Jews better treated than in Moslem-Arab lands. So welcome were American Jewish ambassadors to the Sublime Porte at Constantinople that our Government appointed three of them in a row: Straus, Elkus and Morgenthau.

These Arabs and Moslems cannot understand why the Jewish problem, which is not of their making, should be solved at their expense. They deeply sympathize with the afflicted Jews but are not convinced that Palestine solves the Jewish problem; Palestine does not qualify as a country without a people ready to receive a people without a country. They fail to understand why the American legislators, so solicitous for the welfare of the European Jews, should not lift the bars of immigration and admit Jewish refugees, millions of whom could be settled on the unoccupied plains of Arizona or Texas. This certainly falls within their jurisdiction. The word "reconstitute" in the resolution would no doubt interest them, and they would like to remake the map of Europe and put up their claim on Spain, which they held at a much later date and for a longer period of time. Some of them would raise the question how would the people of the United States react to a suggestion from, say, Russia to reconstitute Oklahoma an Indian territory. They realize they have no spokesmen in America, no high pressure groups, no machinery for influencing American public opinion or legislation, but they are willing to rest their case upon its merits and upon America's sense of justice.

Some of them may have forgotten the Anglo-French declaration of November 8, 1918, promising the peoples so long oppressed by the Turks complete and definitive liberation and "the establishment of national governments and administrations drawing their authority from the initiative and free choice of the indigenous population"; or the words of Woodrow

Wilson's twelfth point that the non-Turkish "nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolute opportunity of autonomous development"; or the corresponding provision in the Covenant of the League of Nations, article 22; but they certainly do remember the third article of the Atlantic Charter that Great Britain and the United States "respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live."

* * *

No Westerner, or Ifranji as called in Arabic, is more highly respected and more implicitly trusted by the Arab and Moslem people than the American. There is reason for it. For years American teachers, preachers, physicians, archeologists, pilgrims and philanthropists have frequented the eastern shore of the Mediterranean with the intent of giving rather than taking and with no imperialistic designs. The American Press at Beirut, the first well equipped press in that region, celebrated its hundredth anniversary eight years ago. The American University of Beirut celebrated its seventy-fifth anniversary three years ago. In this institution a large part of the leaders of thought and action throughout the Arab East were trained. In the first World War and the immediate period following, no less than one hundred million dollars was raised by the American public to relieve suffering among the people of the Near East and to rehabilitate their land—an unparalleled figure in the history of private philanthropy. No wonder the word "American" has become associated in the minds of Arabs and Moslems with fair play, honorable dealing and democratic conduct. All this reservoir of good-will accumulated through generations of unselfish and hard working Americans will be threatened with destruction by the passage of the resolution now before this committee.

The people of the United States are not only interested in winning the war but in contributing to the establishment of a postwar world order in which regional stability is somewhat secure and the chances of future conflicts are at least reduced. Nothing, in the judgment of the speaker, is more conducive to a state of perpetual unrest and conflict than the establishment of a "Jewish commonwealth" at the expense of the Arabs in Palestine. If such a commonwealth were established at the insistence of the United States, we then assume moral responsibility for its preservation. Will the people of the United States be willing to send their navy to protect such a commonwealth if established?

* * *

The British never contemplated such an ambitious scheme as the conversion of Palestine into a "Jewish commonwealth." Sandwiched in

between conflicting promises to the Arabs (which made the once-promised land multipromised), the Balfour declaration, which was echoed in the United States Congress resolution of 1922, viewed with favor, "the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people"—quite a different thing from converting Palestine into a Jewish state. And that was viewed with a big proviso: "It being understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of non-Jewish communities in Palestine." The Zionist representatives proposed to the then British Government this text "the reconstitution of Palestine as the national home of the Jewish people," which is practically the same as the resolution before us has it; but that was not the text adopted.

In its white paper of June 3, 1922, the British Government said:

"Unauthorized statements have been made to the effect that the purpose in view is to create a wholly Jewish Palestine. Phrases have been used such as that Palestine is to become as Jewish as England is English. His majesty's Government regard such expectation as unpracticable and have no such aim in view. . . . They would draw attention to the fact that the terms of the Declaration referred to do not contemplate that Palestine as a whole be converted into a Jewish national home but that such a home should be founded in Palestine. When it is asked what is meant by the development of the Jewish national home in Palestine, it may be answered that it is not the imposition of a Jewish nationality upon the inhabitants of Palestine as a whole, but the further development of the existing Jewish community, with the assistance of Jews from other parts of the world, in order that it may become a center in which the Jewish people as a whole may take, on grounds of religion and race, an interest and a pride."

In its statement of Policy of 1937 the British Government declared:

"that their obligations to Arabs and Jews respectively were not incompatible, on the assumption that in the process of time the two races would so adjust their national aspirations as to render possible the establishment of a single commonwealth under a unitary government."

In the 1939 Statement it was again made clear that Palestine shall be constituted a sovereign independent state, a Palestinian state in which all Palestinians—irrespective of race or origin—will be citizens enjoying equal political, civil and religious rights. In that statement the provision was made for limiting Jewish immigration for economic as well as political reasons. Even then the British administration of Palestine has been

confronted throughout its history with a series of strikes and disturbances beginning April, 1920, and culminating in the serious revolution of 1936.

As early as August, 1919, and before Arab nationalism attained the intensity that it has since assumed, the King-Crane Commission sent by President Wilson reported as follows: "A national home for the Jewish people is not equivalent to making Palestine into a Jewish State; nor can the erection of such a Jewish State be accomplished without the greatest trespass upon the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine." The report warned that the Zionist program could not be carried out except by force of arms.

* * *

The more enlightened and realistic among the Zionists themselves have begun to adopt the British Government point of view, concentrate on the cultural and spiritual aspects of their cause and cooperate with the Arabs. Dr. Judah L. Magnes, president of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem—a Zionist institution—declared in September, 1941, "As far as I am able to see, there is no chance whatsoever that this formula 'establishment of Palestine as a Jewish commonwealth' instead of a national home in Palestine would be acceptable by any responsible Arab or Arab party or any part of Arabic public opinion." The Union Association organized in September, 1942, by Zionists in Jerusalem declared its conviction that the problem of Palestine was inseparable from that of the Near East, advocated a Jewish Arab state and held that the two peoples' equality was vital to the future of Palestine. Robert M. Hyamson, British Zionist, in *Palestine: A Policy* (1942) interprets "national" as pertaining to nationality rather than nation. President Julian Morgenstern, of Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati, in his last contribution entitled *Nation, People, Religion: What Are We?* declares:

"Despite the oft-repeated, high sounding asseverations of the beneficent role which a restored Jewish state or commonwealth may play or will play in setting a happy pattern of equitable social relations for all other nations to emulate, the most recent formulation of which is in the highly bombastic peroration of the so-called Palestine resolution of the American Jewish Conference, the fact incontestably established by history still confronts us with brazen truth, that the true genius and destiny of Israel find expression only in its role as a religious people, the bearers of a spiritual heritage."

Thus we see that the passage of this Resolution now before your Committee is inimical to the best interests of the Arabs, the Americans, the British and even the Jews.

II

TESTIMONY OF FARIS S. MALOUF

PRESIDENT, SYRIAN AND LEBANESE FEDERATION OF THE
EASTERN STATES

BEFORE

THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ON

RESOLUTIONS RELATIVE TO THE JEWISH NATIONAL HOME IN PALESTINE

FEBRUARY 16, 1944

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

The only question before your Committee is whether or not the Congress should adopt this Resolution and whether or not the United States can properly use its good offices with the government of Great Britain to abrogate the White Paper of 1939 and advocate the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine. I as a citizen of the United States question the advisability of the adoption of this Resolution and very much question the right of the United States to interfere in this matter. I also think that the rank and file of American citizens will not want to have anything to do with the Palestine controversy although they will very much like to help solve the Jewish problem and protect the Jews against persecution. Rabbi Wise [Stephen S. Wise, Chairman, American Zionist Emergency Council] stated yesterday that he thinks an overwhelming majority of the American people, if given an opportunity to vote whether or not this Resolution should be adopted, will vote for it. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, and members of this Committee, the Zionist organization is very powerful in this country and they are located in every State in the Union. I don't know of any reason why they can't carry some such policy as raised by this Resolution to the voters of the individual States or at least some of them and thus test the will of the people. I am positive that the American people will not want to impose on a free people an artificial religious foreign state. . . .

There was a long period of time—centuries, if you please—when there was no controversy concerning Palestine. Most of us in this room remember the last days of that happy period when no one was making

any claims against the Holy Land contrary to the rights of its indigenous population. Something happened which gave birth to this dispute. At a time when Great Britain was fighting with its back to the wall, as then described by Lloyd George, shrewd Zionist leaders drove a bargain with His Majesty's government and in an unfortunate moment for the three parties, the Jews, the Arabs and the English, the Balfour Declaration—a secret document secretly arrived at, so far as the Arabs were concerned—was born and with it began the Palestine controversy.

The most important element in this whole controversy which has been lost sight of is that Palestine has been an integral part of Syria for twenty-five centuries. The fact that international chicanery and Zionist-British schemes separated it from her motherland does not make it a separate country. Syria is determined that the Balfour Declaration and Congressional Resolutions based upon it shall not be the final chapter in the history of Palestine. The Zionists then began their efforts for a national home which has since then developed through their ambitions into a Jewish commonwealth. For the following reasons the claims of the Zionists cannot be maintained:

1. At the time Lord Balfour made his declaration, November 2, 1917, Palestine was not a part of the British Empire, nor was it in possession of the Jews, whose population of Palestine was only 55,000 as against 800,000 Arabs, and England had no right to make any promises in respect thereto.

2. At the time Balfour made his declaration, Britain had through Sir Henry MacMahon already entered into a solemn agreement with King Husein in behalf of the Arabs, October 25, 1915, that England would recognize and assist in the establishment of an independent Arab state including Palestine. The Arabs were then in complete possession of Palestine and were about to declare their independence and revolt against the Turkish Empire. In consideration of this agreement on the part of England the Arabs revolted against Turkey and shed their blood for three years with the armies of the Allies against the combined forces of the central powers and Turkey.

3. Lord Balfour's Declaration was made secretly to a private English gentleman, Lord Rothschild, and it was more than a year later that the Arabs learned of it. One cannot help asking what right has England to give somebody else's country to a people who were disunited, unorganized and scattered among the nations of the world, without consulting the people who are immediately concerned and who have occupied that land as its natives from time immemorial and certainly owned it and inhabited it for the last thirteen centuries?

4. In view of the clear binding agreement between England and King

Husein, the Balfour Declaration, secretly issued and intentionally concealed from the Arabs, was dishonest, insincere, ambiguous and impossible of enforcement.

It was dishonest because the Arabs who were the primary party in interest were not consulted; it was insincere because it does not purport to give the Jews any definite or specific rights, for careful study and consideration of the wording of the declaration will show that the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine is subordinated to and conditioned upon a statement which reveals conscious guilt on the part of England. That statement is found in the second half of the declaration as follows:

"It being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil or religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine."

How could that [Jewish National Home] be obtained without "prejudicing the civil or religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine."

With the Balfour Declaration and the efforts of the Zionists to establish their Jewish national home in Palestine in disregard of the Arabs' wishes, a revolution was begun. Concerning this revolution the Royal Commission reported the following findings of facts:

"It is, indeed, one of the most unhappy aspects of the present situation—this opening of a breach between the Jewry and the Arab world. We believe that in ordinary circumstances the Arabs would be ready enough to permit a measure of Jewish immigration under their own conditions and control, but the creation of a national home has been neither conditioned nor controlled by the Arabs of Palestine. It has been established directly against their will. . . . The reasons of this breach are:

"First. The establishment of a national home involved at the outset a blank negation of the right implied in the principle of national self-government;

"Second. It soon proved to be not merely an obstacle to the development of national self-government, but apparently the only serious obstacle;

"Third. As the home has grown, the fear has grown with it, that if and when self-government is conceded, it may not be national in the Arab sense, but government by a Jewish majority."

The Resolution before your honorable Committee is based on the Balfour Declaration and follows a similar resolution adopted by the Congress June 30, 1922, which is better known as the Lodge-Fish Resolution,

except that the present Resolution goes much further than the Lodge-Fish Resolution. . . .

The Lodge-Fish Resolution does not go any further than that "the United States of America favors the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people."

The present Resolution advocates the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine.

There are countless reasons why this Resolution ought not to pass. I shall deal with only a few of these reasons.

1. All the three documents, the Balfour Declaration, the Lodge-Fish Resolution and the present Resolution, are full of inconsistencies, . . . for each one of them provides that nothing shall be done to prejudice the rights of the people in Palestine. Here the reference is to the people who were in Palestine prior to the Balfour Resolution. Then the language of these documents goes on to provide for a national home and now a Jewish commonwealth. How can anyone establish a political state composed of people who are recently gathered and more of them to be gathered from the four corners of the globe and put them in Palestine and wait until such a time as they become the majority before self-government can be established? This certainly prejudices the rights of the Arabs in Palestine. The next inconsistency is the establishment of a Jewish commonwealth which is a religious state. How can you establish a Jewish state after the Jews have become the majority in Palestine and still call it a democratic state as against the people who profess different religions? Our understanding of democracy is a complete separation of the state and the church.

2. It took Great Britain twenty-two years from November, 1917, to the spring of 1939 to discover its grave mistake at the cost of several uprisings in Palestine which culminated in the Arabs' war for independence from 1936 to 1939, resulting in the destruction of thousands of Arab homes and the shedding of much Arab, Jewish and English blood, and also after endangering the relations of Great Britain with the Arab and Moslem world. In 1939, England sought to rectify the wrong by issuing the White Paper, after long conferences with representatives of the Arabs and Jews and after recommendations of several Royal Commissions appointed by his Majesty's government to study the situation. Therefore the White Paper is not an appeasement measure. Rather, it is a solemn pledge arrived at after exhaustive study and consultations by the British Government with both the Arabs and the Zionists. Now, after all of this, we find the Zionist influence at work in these United States to get Congress to adopt this Resolution as if the lesson learned by Great Britain after a quarter of a century of struggle

and bloodshed has been of no value to the Zionists in the United States who would advocate a Jewish commonwealth in Palestine at the expense of the Arabs. Great Britain is now seeking to rectify this wrong. Shall we go on to aggravate it? . . .

3. In order to make the mandate of this Resolution effective, force must be used. If Great Britain rejects our good offices does the Congress want the United States Government to war upon our friends, the Arabs? Will the American people sanction the use of force upon the Arabs so that they may give way to the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth in Palestine? If this is not contemplated by this Resolution, is it then our purpose simply to give the Jews lip service without any genuine conviction behind it? Or is it simply a nice expression of a sympathy which might be all right to please the Zionists among us, but which will gain for us the suspicions and the lack of confidence on the part of the Arabs?

If you entertain the possibility of subduing and silencing the Arabs of Palestine by some magic and because they are not a strong nation, what about the fifty million Arabs in the Near and Middle East? What about the three hundred million more Mohammedans in Asia and Africa? Great Britain has heard from them and saw the justice of their cause.

4. The passage of this Resolution strikes at the foundation and the principles for which our men and women are dying on every battlefield and on every continent today. Its passage will strike at the confidence the United States enjoys throughout the world. It will nullify the Atlantic Charter which guarantees self-government and sovereignty for all nations.

Here I want to beg your indulgence to mention statements made to this Committee by the House Leaders of both the majority and minority parties who appeared before you the other day and pleaded for approval of this Resolution, and my purpose in mentioning what these two gentlemen had to say to you is not in the spirit of condemning persons whom I respect, but for the sole purpose of touching upon the noble motives which constrain some of our governmental and civil leaders to support the establishment of a Jewish Homeland in Palestine, and to show that these noble motives, to say the least, are misplaced, misguided and wrongly applied. . . .

My neighbor from South Boston is reported by the United Press to have said "The least the House of Representatives can do is to go on record showing it thinks along humane lines." Is it humane to drive the Arabs out of their homes and country in order to give them to others who by all the legal and moral codes have lost any claim to them for more than two thousand years? Is it humane to reduce the Arabs to a minority

in their land which the Royal Peel Commission described in its report to the British Government in July, 1937, as follows: "Palestine or, more strictly speaking, Syria, of which Palestine had been a part since the days of Nebuchadnezzar (605-562 B.C.) was to the Arabs their country, their home, the land in which their people for centuries past had lived and left their graves." The speaker before you last week further said "We could not close our eyes to the plight of two million homeless Jews in Europe. This is a challenge of all kinds of justice particularly Christian justice." Oh Lord! How many iniquities have been committed in Thy name.

The other gentleman, also from Massachusetts, said he had been in sympathy with the attitude of the Resolution for twenty years and believed the guarantee of Palestine as a Jewish Homeland offered "solution to a world problem." This gentleman, Leader of the Minority, failed to take into consideration the sacred rights of the people of Palestine who have been its rightful owners and whose soil is made of their blood and of the remains of their forebears long before the Jews came into Palestine. This gentleman has utterly failed to visualize the bloodshed which will be necessary in order to oust the Arabs out of their homes.

5. The passage of this Resolution will strike at the principles for which we are fighting this war as declared in the Atlantic Charter because it tends to withhold self-government from the Arabs of Palestine until such a time as the Jews have become the majority when they and not the Arabs will be in control. . . .

6. It is very important for the molding of the United States' policy towards the Near East to take into consideration the fact that Palestine is the southern part of Syria and has been part of Syria for twenty-five centuries, that Syria and Lebanon inspired, I believe, by the United States and Great Britain have just attained their full independence and Syria has never relinquished her right to Palestine as its natural southern part, nor do the people of Palestine wish to be separated from Syria. . . .

7. The passage of this Resolution will be the greatest disservice to innocent Jews everywhere. Those who have succeeded in getting into Palestine in the last twenty years and who number five hundred thousand may, if further immigration is stopped and the establishment of a political Jewish State is given up, live in Palestine in peace and participate in its affairs on equal footing with the Arabs. If this Resolution is passed and if our government and the government of Great Britain undertake to enforce its provisions, you will have endangered not only the interest but the very lives of the Jews in Palestine and consequently placed them in an unenviable position throughout the world.

I wish to say with the most sincere conviction that history cannot justly attribute to any distinct element of mankind greater, continuous or more lasting contributions to civilization, than those made and being made by the Jews. Those of us who are opposing this Resolution do condemn and abhor their persecution as repulsive to human conscience and we do not attempt to ignore the existence of a Jewish problem or the urgency for its just solution. The solution, however, requires frankness and courage to face the truth.

If the Jews are really seeking a refuge and a homeland where they can live in peace and develop their distinct abilities, Palestine can never become that refuge and it can never solve their problem, certainly not through political Zionism. Palestine, however, will welcome the establishment within its gates of spiritual and cultural Zionism which will revive for the benefit of the entire world the idealism which marked the ancient Hebrews and Jews as a distinct people. This can be accomplished by a restricted and moderate immigration into Palestine of the type of Jewish people who desire to revive for themselves and the world a spiritual and cultural Zionism in the same manner as that of the American missionaries and educational groups who have gone to work in the Near East and in other parts of the world.

It is not for me and it is doubtful whether it is for anybody else but the Jews themselves to determine their future course. I will, however, say that if the great and able leaders of thought among the Jews insist that they should have a political state, then it would seem to be the sacred duty and the happy privilege of the United States and Great Britain to offer out of their vast, and practically vacant territories, a suitable place for the establishment of a Jewish state, where they can enjoy self-government without losing the sentimental and religious values which they entertain for Palestine, and let Palestine be their missionary home. . . .

Insofar as the present Jewish population in Palestine is concerned, the Arabs intend, provided immigration is stopped and a proportional representative government is created, to afford them protection with all the privileges of the land which are enjoyed by the Arabs themselves, and to guaranty their minority rights by constitutional provisions and proper international obligations. This the Arabs will consider their sacred obligation for a world trust.

Finally, as the Jewish problem calls for a just solution, it ill behooves the Jews who are rightly clamoring for their minority rights, and who are protesting against Hitler's methods, to disregard the rights of the great majority in Palestine, and to urge and advocate a policy which requires the use of force against the Arabs.

III

TESTIMONY OF K. S. TWITCHELL

CONSULTING ENGINEER, SAUDI ARABIA MINING
SYNDICATE, AND FORMER CHIEF OF UNITED STATES
AGRICULTURAL MISSION TO SAUDI ARABIA

BEFORE

THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ON

RESOLUTIONS RELATIVE TO THE JEWISH NATIONAL HOME IN PALESTINE

FEBRUARY 16, 1944

Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am simply a free-born American citizen and I represent nobody but myself.

I have been in that part of the world [Middle East] a great deal, and my last trip was last year, I returned last year. It was a trip to Saudi Arabia. That is not part of Palestine, but it is part of that section. I visited Palestine for a short period last year.

In the hope that my experience in Yemen and Saudi Arabia and so forth, may be of benefit in considering the matter of Palestine, I have come here. Everyone agrees upon two aspects:

(1) That it is a most complex matter.

(2) That Americans have the greatest sympathy for the persecuted Jewish and other minorities.

As I have spent a number of years in the Near East, 1915-1919 and 1926 to date, it is possible that I realize the dangers and ramifications better than many people. We desire to help solve this question in a way that will not involve bloodshed and injustice. First I want to point out the dangerous possibilities, as I see them and I may be wrong; and secondly I wish to make suggestions for your consideration.

At the outset I wish to emphasize that it is not only the 1,000,000 or less Arabs which are concerned in Palestine, but that 300,000,000 Moslems throughout the Near East and India are vitally interested in this matter.

Supposing the recommendation I have seen advertised in one of the great newspapers were adopted for the removal of Arabs from Palestine to Iraq? Who would finance such a removal and the development of new farms and homes? Would not the average American taxpayer resent any such thought and consequently become perhaps anti-Semitic? I am afraid there would be the following results:

First: Recent history indicates there would be a great deal of resistance and bloodshed in Palestine itself as it is well known that both Arabs and Jews have considerable amounts of arms.

Second: The Moslems in Yemen, Arabia, might annihilate the 40,000 Jews now there. I wonder if they might not be viewed as hostages and in a similar manner the 100,000 Jews now in Iraq and who have lived there peacefully for over 1,300 years.

Third: In Egypt there might be great riots and anti-non-Moslem reactions which could result in the greatly handicapping of the large non-Moslem interest in education, the American University, and so forth, and in business.

Fourth: In Turkey the non-Moslems might be treated in a manner similar to the Arabs from Palestine and be deported—in this case Jews (70,000) and Christian Armenians would, perhaps, suffer most.

Fifth: In India the 90,000,000 Moslems who have upheld the British Government when the Hindu Indian Congress was making passive resistance, would very probably voice great opposition to a removal of Arab Moslems and might cause great disturbance and trouble which would interfere with our war against Japan in that sphere.

Sixth: There are many Moslems in Java, China, and the Philippines to whom this matter would undoubtedly be broadcast by the Japs and Germans so might cause a great antagonism toward the Allies as these people might fear similar removals after this war.

Seventh: Along the African routes of our air transport, most of the countries traversed are Moslem inhabited; could not there be many acts of sabotage by angry Moslems all along both the North African and central African routes?

Eighth: If the proposed pipe line for bringing American-controlled oil from the Persian Gulf eventuates, an unfriendly Arab people along this line would be a constant menace and might involve American troops.

Do you believe the American public would wish their sons to be sent to the many points in Moslem countries on police duty and possibly lose their lives in a matter entirely aside from our fight for the four freedoms? Might this not cause anti-Semitic feeling? Troubles in Boston suggest this possibility.

The British Government can tell you what it has cost in lives and

money to keep their Palestine Mandate. Does the American Government wish to assume such liabilities?

Would it not be wise to leave such a many sided question to be worked out cooperatively with the British after victory is won?

Now for the other side. The United States Department of Agriculture can confirm, or not, my statement that Palestine has now been developed to nearly its maximum productivity under present conditions. The Palestine Government Partition Report to the British Government, 1938, Command 5854, tends to confirm this statement. Only if the irrigation project to bring water from Syria to Palestine eventuates, can any very considerable additional acreage be cultivated. But in Palestine there are great areas, which are steep limestone mountains with very thin soil and able only to support grazing—and not very much of that during the hottest parts of the summer seasons. My first trip from Jerusalem to Jericho was in July, 1929. The progress made to date in agriculture is a very great achievement and a credit to the energy of the present population and Jewish financing.

To add greatly to the present population would not seem to be sound economy and would not attain the aims of those of Jewish faith for the above reasons.

There are four places which I suggest be seriously investigated for the benefit of those who wish new homes. Other locations like the Dominican Republic, and Benguela in Angola, Portuguese West Africa have already been suggested and considered, I believe. [Then Mr. Twitchell suggested Cyrenaica, North Africa; Gojam, Abyssinia; the Province of Minas Geraes, Brazil; and British Guiana.]

I am very much afraid that the Jewish interests in America as well as in the Near East will suffer if the proposed Resolution is passed, especially during this present time of stress when we should be cooperating to the fullest with our allies and not raising controversial questions and resolutions.

IV

PALESTINIAN ARABS DESCENDED FROM NATIVES BEFORE ABRAHAM

BY PROFESSOR PHILIP K. HITTI

AN ARTICLE APPEARING IN THE *Princeton Herald*, APRIL 21, 1944

IN ANSWER TO

CRITICISMS DIRECTED AT HIS TESTIMONY BEFORE THE

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

BY DR. ALBERT EINSTEIN AND DR. ERIC KAHLER

DR. EINSTEIN AND DR. KAHLER introduce their criticism of my testimony before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs by describing it as "one-sided." After several days of favorable Zionist testimony, I was called upon, in accordance with long-standing democratic practice, to present the other side. And my testimony was followed by that of many other Zionists and proved to be, with one exception, the only one which presented the other side.

The first issue that the two distinguished writers take with me is a historical one. They maintain that "the Arabs have no priority over the land," because "both Jews and Arabs are said to stem from a common ancestor, from Abraham who immigrated into Canaan, i.e. Palestine." But when Abraham—assuming his historicity—migrated into Canaan he did not find it empty, as even a superficial acquaintance with the Old Testament literature would indicate. The so-called Arabs of Palestine, particularly the Christians among them, are the modern representatives of that ancient native stock. The Hebrews came and went. The natives remained. The Hebrew Kingdom of Israel was destroyed in 722 B.C. by the Assyrian Sargon II; that of Judah by Nebuchadnezzar in 586 B.C. First the ten then the two tribes were carried away into captivity. All flickers of national life were extinguished by later rulers and the hold of the Jews over Palestine was gone forever.

The two authors then proceeded to dispute another historical point. They claim that the Moslem "Arabs contributed their share to depriving the Jews of their homeland and so to the making of the Jewish problem." The two critics evidently are not aware of the fact that the Moslems con-

quered Palestine in the seventh century after Christ (Palestine was then Christian, not Jewish) from the Byzantines, who were the heirs of the Romans, who had wrested it from the Seleucids, who were successors of Alexander the Great, who had acquired it from the Persians, who had destroyed the Chaldaean Empire in 538 B.C., which had controlled Palestine since Nebuchadnezzar's conquest. A casual acquaintance with my *History of the Arabs*, which the two gentlemen quote in another connection, would have spared them this error. But obviously Dr. Einstein's acquaintance with the antecedents and setting of the Arab-Zionist problem does not far surpass my acquaintance with his theory of relativity.

Using my testimony as a springboard, the two scholars ignore the arguments presented against political Zionism from the British, the American and Jewish points of view and proceed to present the orthodox Zionist doctrine, claiming at the same time that they "do not speak in the name of the Zionist movement." The arguments they give are a rehash of the Zionist arguments repeated over years, and intensified in recent months from the radio, platform, newspapers, books and propaganda sheets. None of the arguments hold water when subjected to close scrutiny.

The first may be termed the argument of the "have not's" against the "have's." "The Arabs possess four major countries," we are told; "this tiny Palestinian country, on the other hand, is the only place in the world legitimately and most deeply connected with the Jewish people." Does not this strike a familiar note to the readers of apologies for modern aggression? Immigration and colonization, be it remembered, are a form of attenuated invasion. In the case of political Zionism, they are a professed though peaceful invasion implied in the Resolution before the Congressional Committees in Washington:

"That the United States shall use its good offices and take appropriate measures to the end that the doors of Palestine shall be opened for free entry into that country and that there shall be full opportunity for colonization so that the Jewish people may ultimately reconstitute Palestine as a free and democratic Jewish commonwealth."

In one of the official British Commission's reports, the process of Jewish penetration is termed by the Arabs a "creeping conquest," and a creeping conquest it is. In a recent note of protest to Washington from Iraq, the passage of this resolution was declared as tantamount to a declaration of war by the United States on the Arabs of Palestine.

From the above often-repeated argument, Dr. Einstein and his collaborator proceed to another often-repeated argument: the humanitarian

one, emphasizing the plight of European Jews under Hitler's heels and the necessity for alleviating their misery. What makes the position of those opposing the "reconstituting of Palestine as a Jewish commonwealth" (and all organized opposition in the United States comes from the Jews themselves) rather embarrassing is that they may seem irresponsible to the humane call. The fact is that in the discussion that followed the testimony in Washington the present writer declared as an American citizen that he would welcome legislation admitting Jews and non-Jews to these shores. The official attitude of our Government toward the refugee problem was expressed by Assistant Secretary Breckinridge Long in recent testimony before a Congressional committee where, after discussing the recommendations of the Bermuda Conference headed by our own President Dodds, Mr. Long made it clear that the Jewish refugee problem could not be isolated and that the Government could not exclude persons other than Jews from its activities.

What makes the action of the scores of American senators, representatives, governors (Dewey included) and other high officials who in this year of election have seen fit to sign the numerous Zionist manifestos appear hypocritical is the fact that none of these gentlemen appear willing to raise a finger to lift the bars of immigration into the United States. Let the British force the Palestinians, who have already witnessed the advent of hundreds of thousands of Jews into their midst in the last twenty years, to admit more Zionists until they become a majority and rule the land. Such in short is their easy solution of one of the world's knottiest problems!

The third argument, also a familiar one, advanced by Einstein and Kahler, is what may be termed the successful cultivation of the soil. "They [the Zionists] took over from the period of Arabian predominance deserts and rocks and barren soil and turned them into flowering farms and plantations, into forests and modern cities." This also has a customary ring in the ears of those who listened to—for example—Italian apologists in Tripoli (1912) and in Ethiopia (1935). But be that as it may; anyone with first-hand knowledge of the real economic situation can prick this bubble of highly publicized, greatly advertised "Palestinian prosperity." The plain truth is that the Zionist colonies are still living on charity. The difference between their prosperity and the genuine thing is precisely the difference between a plump healthy cheek with red blood corpuscles and a puffed-up one smeared with rouge. The Palestine Homeland is at present 40% self-supporting according to British estimates. The American consul general in Jerusalem reports that \$5,500,000 are poured annually from the United States alone to support it. Let this process of "artificial respiration" cease and it would not be

difficult to see what would happen. The unbalanced condition of the whole country's economy may be evidenced by the fact that from 1926-27 the imports exceeded the exports by as much as 5-1, and from 1937-39 by 2½-1. As for the advantages which we have been repeatedly told have accrued to the native population, suffice it to quote article 3 of the constitution of the enlarged Jewish Agency signed at Zurich, August 14, 1929: "The land acquired shall be held as the inalienable property of the Jewish people" (a provision to this effect is incorporated in every lease), and "in all the works or undertakings carried out or furthered by this Agency it shall be deemed to be a matter of principle that Jewish labor shall be employed"—a perpetual boycott against Arab labor.

The statement of Dr. Einstein and Dr. Kahler ends on a meek note. "We do not resort to threats of power, for the Jews have no power," etc., which does not exactly jibe with recent declarations of Zionist spokesmen and with the reports about smuggling of arms, manufacture of hand grenades and explosion of bombs in the Zionist parts of Palestine. Ziff, a Zionist spokesman, would "make the Arabs go back to the desert where they came from." Weizmann, the head of Zionism, would "facilitate" Arab transference from Palestine. Ben-Horin is more frank. He, as announced in his book and full-page advertisements in the *New York Times*, endorsed by scores of prominent and wealthy Americans, would solve the problem once for all by transferring the Arab population not only of Palestine but of Transjordan also into Iraq to make room for Zionists. Militant Zionism is quite a different thing from what my two distinguished neighbors seem to take it to be.

Sober and realistic Jews realize that it is on such stuff as presented by militant and political Zionism that anti-Semitism feeds. They recognize the unpracticability of the Zionist political program, consider Judaism a religion and not a political state and admit that the great contribution of Israel throughout the ages has been in the spiritual and intellectual rather than the political realm. They have no desire to deprive the Arab population of its civil rights, guaranteed in the Balfour Declaration, and would like to see a *Palestinian* state—neither Jewish nor Moslem—in which all citizens, regardless of faith or origin become equal and free citizens. They know for a fact that when the present war is over many of the European Jews would want to return to their old homelands of which they were citizens first and Jews second; unless this war makes it safe for European Jews and non-Jews to live in harmony and peace it would have been fought in vain. As American Jewish citizens, they must have received the latest reports that of the 5,500 American Jews now in Palestine only 100 have forsaken their American citizenship and the rest are

worried to death lest this war be so prolonged that they would lose their opportunity to return to the States at least to renew their passports. The sober and realistic Arabs are likewise beginning to realize that many of the Jews now in Palestine are there to stay, and that the Arabs' own interest and future welfare require that they cooperate with these newcomers on an equal basis to the end that a new Palestine shall arise worthy of its honored name and noble heritage.

[Reprinted by the kind permission of the *Princeton Herald*]

V

ARAB NATIONALISM AND POLITICAL ZIONISM

BY WILLIAM ERNEST HOCKING

ALFORD PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY EMERITUS; HARVARD UNIVERSITY

THE EXTRAORDINARY PRESSURE with which the question of Palestine is being urged on Congress would be disturbing under any circumstances. Are we being hurried into action before we see clearly what the issues are? In my judgment, the motives for the agitation are not fully realized by the public, nor some of the main facts which must govern our judgment.

It is natural that this agitation should put forward as its chief burden the humanitarian concern we all feel for the plight of Jewish refugees from Europe. The immediate political objective, of inducing the British Government to review the policy of its White Paper, is presented as subsidiary to the problem of refuge. Senator Taft, speaking on March 9 at the annual meeting of the American Palestine Commission announced it as the primary purpose of his Bill "to find a place of refuge for the four million surviving Jews of Europe." In my judgment, Senator Taft and the American public as well, ought to weigh very carefully both the humanitarian and the political objectives, and consider to what extent the proposed means will serve the humanitarian end; and to what extent it will serve other ends.

On the humanitarian objective: a place or places of refuge for Jews driven from Europe must be provided: this is an imperative international responsibility. It is easy to run from this axiom to the conclusion that Palestine ought to be thrown open at once to immigration, and without the terminus proposed in the White Paper. This conclusion would follow if Palestine were the only place, or the best place, or even a possible place for more than a limited number of refugees; and if there were no opposing considerations. None of these things can be taken for granted.

It is certainly not the only place now open. Nor purely from the standpoint of living possibilities is it the best place. And as for the four million refugees of Senator Taft's speech, the suggestion that this number can find livelihood in Palestine *in any near time* is fantastic. The "absorp-

tive capacity of Palestine" has been a matter of heated debate, into which there is no need here to enter. Let me mention only what will be generally agreed upon. On the agricultural possibilities of that New Hampshire-sized country (about 10,000 square miles) about half the area is cultivable: of the 6,579,750 acres, estimates of the cultivable area vary from 3 million to 4 million acres (W. C. Lowdermilk, *Palestine, Land of Promise*, pp. 222 f.). Since as a matter of course, the best of this is already occupied, the question is how much of the remainder can be brought to fairly good condition, even with a wholly disproportionate investment: a third of this half would seem a fair estimate. No one doubts that if the Zionist-held area can be extended, processes of reclamation costly and slow can bring more acres under cultivation. For the refugees, however, the issue is not what can be done in twenty years, but what can be done soon. The answer has to be, nothing remotely adequate.

One hope now being urged for large increase in the capacity of Palestine is in a program of intensive industrialization. Each one must judge for himself the lasting value of a forced industrial development of a land so little favored by nature; and whether a Palestine with none but imported fuel, a rainfall too meager for even its present human uses, and an extremely limited water power is an appropriate center for an industry based on the resources of the wider Near East. But again, no one will doubt that such industrial building must grow *pari passu* with lines of supply and market outlets which cannot be improvised on any considerable scale prior to or apart from a general world settlement. In such a settlement, the interests of the Arab lands for developing their own industries will require to be heard. In any case, the rate of Palestinian development could not be sufficient to meet the early needs of any important fraction of Europe's refugee Jews.

And since the ground upon which Palestine is chiefly claimed as a uniquely necessary place for a National Home for the Jewish people is not its economic advantage, but its religious association, it may be worth while to mention that a Palestine heavily industrialized is a Palestine defaced from this point of view for Jew, Moslem and Christian alike.

Americans easily confuse the meaning of Palestine as a place of refuge with its meaning as a cultural or national home for the Jewish people. Not only are the two meanings distinct; they are in some measure at cross purposes. For the Jews in Palestine who are animated by a burning historical piety are not at ease with the more recent influx from Europe of Jews whose religion is rather that of a social goal than that of the Religious Law or of the Holy Land. If the emphasis is placed on the rights of religious association, we have to remember that for the Moslems also Jerusalem is a sacred city. And the very site of the ancient

Jewish Temple is now occupied by the Great al-Aksa Mosque (begun 690 A.D.); and so rooted in Moslem tradition as the scene of a miraculous event in the life of Mohammed that any attempt on the part of Zionism to return to its ancient spot of worship would—relations between Jews and Moslems being what they now are—have to be made by force. This is certainly not contemplated by anybody at this time; and the inference is that the importance of Palestine as a place of Jewish settlement cannot be based either on the needs of refugees or on the grounds of pious necessity, but rather precisely where the Balfour Declaration has put it, on the desirability of a national home for the Jewish people. What that declaration means is so much misunderstood, and unfortunately also so much misrepresented, that it must again be restated.

The Balfour Declaration, issued November 2, 1917, used these words:

"His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish People, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing shall be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of non-Jewish communities in Palestine. . . ."

What this Declaration *did not promise was the reconstitution of Palestine as the National Home of the Jews.*

This latter formula, which is now being urged by certain pressure groups as the substance of the Declaration was in fact asked for by the British Zionists in 1917, and expressly rejected by the British Government. This rejection has been renewed at various subsequent times, as in the White Paper of June, 1922. There is a world of difference between a Home *within* Palestine, and *reconstituting* Palestine (making the whole place over) as *the* Home, or as a Jewish community.

It was precisely this "within" feature which made it possible for Zionists at Paris to win the apparent acceptance of the idea by the Arab Delegation there headed by Emir Feisal. The circumstances of the interchange between Mr. Frankfurter and Emir Feisal have been discussed at length since that time. One thing that has become clear, in my opinion, is that Feisal at that time had hopes of an Arab Kingdom—hopes abetted by Great Britain—with himself as ruler of Syria in Damascus; and for the Arabs, Syria traditionally includes Palestine.* Thus Feisal's

* The articles of agreement which Feisal signed with Dr. Chaim Weizmann carried the following rider:

"Provided the Arabs obtain their independence as demanded in my Memorandum dated the 4th of January, 1919, to the Foreign Office of the Government of Great Britain, I shall concur in the above articles. But if the slightest modification or departure were to be made, I shall not then be bound by a single word of the present

approval of a Zionist community in Palestine was dependent on its enclosure within a dominant Arab state. It must also be said that Feisal's signature to the famous and much questioned letter has never carried weight with the Arab world. Any representation that the Arab people of Palestine or elsewhere, either then or at any subsequent time, agreed to the reconstitution of Palestine as a Jewish community is false.

When therefore one of the groups now pressing for the abrogation of the White Paper announces that the Jews of Palestine "did not come to form a new minority," they are in effect not appealing for the enforcement of the Balfour Declaration but for its replacement. Why do they wish to become a majority unless it is in order that (as the Shaw Report of 1930 put it) "under a democratic rule the Jewish view should always prevail"?

At present they are not too far from that goal as an effective working proposition. In 1919 (to use the figures of the Palestine Partition Commission of 1938) there were in Palestine 58,000 Jews and 642,000 Arabs (Moslem and Christian). Jews were then roughly 10% of the total. In 1937, there were about 402,000 Jews and 990,000 Arabs. Today we may estimate about 600,000 Jews and 1,000,000 Arabs. Allow some weight to the concentration of Jews in towns (only about 23% are on the soil) and their superior skill and practice in political action, and it would seem that a Jewish-controlled Palestine is within reach. It is this which the Arabs fear.

Putting these various items together, does it not appear that the animus of the present drive is not primarily humanitarian but political?

* * *

But why not? Why should not Palestine be made over into a new Jewish community? The case is not to be judged solely by existing documents and the rights thereby created. It has to be judged *de novo*, in the light of present world conditions.

The cultural progress of the Zionist colonies in Palestine has been remarkable in many ways. The great Hebrew University on Mount Scopus and its library are monuments to the breadth and wisdom of its founders and builders. The large influx of Jewish capital into Palestine has furnished a basis for taxation (levied on the Arabs as well) which the British Government has used in part for public improvements—roads, public health, etc.—in which the Arabs have a natural share. At the same time, the Arab feels his total economic position less secure than

Agreement, which shall be deemed void and of no account or validity, and I shall not be answerable in any way whatsoever."

George Antonius, *The Arab Awakening*, Supplement.

before. Why this is the case, a single item relating to farm labor, will sufficiently illustrate:

It is especially the position of the Arab agricultural laborer that has to be considered, for most Arabs (and this is part of the traditional charm of the land) have gained their livelihood from the soil. What has been happening to him may best appear by quoting from a lease of the Jewish National Fund as to Jewish settlers on Palestinian land:

"The lessee undertakes to execute all works connected with the cultivation of the holding only with Jewish labour. Failure to comply with this duty by the employment of non-Jewish labour shall render the lessee liable to the payment of a compensation of ten Palestinian pounds for each default. . . . Where the lessee has contravened the provisions of this Article three times the Fund may apply the right of restitution of the holding, without paying any compensation whatever."*

The Jewish Agency provides in its Constitution that

"Land is to be acquired as Jewish property . . . title to be taken in the name of the Jewish National Fund, to the end that the same shall be held as the inalienable property of the Jewish people."*

On this arrangement, land bought by the Jewish Agency, let us say from an Arab landlord employing Arab labor, ceases automatically to be a place of possible residence or work to those laborers. As Sir John Simpson put the matter in his Report:

"It ceases to be land from which the Arab can gain any advantage either now or at any other time in the future. . . . He is deprived forever from employment on that land. . . . Nor can anyone help him by purchasing the land and restoring it to common use. The land is in mortmain and inalienable."*

There have been good reasons, from the standpoint of providing occupation for more Jewish immigrants, for such policies as these; but it is at least understandable that despite improvements in other ways, despite the fact that every step of the advance of Zionist ownership is legitimate, and paid for at high prices, the Arab masses as a whole have felt their relative position deteriorating. It is not a question of the number of persons dispossessed, and undisposed to accept compensation. It is a question of the attitude of the slowly advancing power. Its strength, intelligence, cash backing, splendid equipment, render it in Arab eyes the more formidable because of this attitude. Hence they have come to face the future with concern.

* All quotations from Simpson Report, Cmd. 3686, 1930.

But why not override these feelings, which after all affect only a relatively few people on a very small piece of land? Why cannot the Arabs give up an insignificant fraction of their "immense domain," and even accept the idea of an exchange of population with, let us say, Iraq, if it will make for the realization of the Jewish dream? This proposal is now being vigorously urged in some quarters and many Americans are impressed by its apparent reasonableness.

Those who are promoting this view do not explain what they propose to do with the extensive religious establishments of Islam in Palestine, including the great mosques and various schools. These establishments are not, like those of the Christians, primarily of a memorial nature: they are important educational and devotional centers for a living religion, within the region of its central activity. To maintain such establishments a considerable local population is required and assumed: to deport the million Arabs to Iraq would be another way of strangling these institutions. They require also a flow of worshippers and pilgrims, both physically and morally free to come and go. The entire Moslem world is concerned in this. If we think the matter unimportant, they do not.

As for the "immense domain" of the Arab peoples, that is largely desert. The cultivable portions are chiefly strewn around the rim, whose northern arch is known as the Fertile Crescent. The value of Palestine to either Arab or Zionist does not derive from its size but from its situation, and the functions which that situation enables it to carry out.

The material and present-day advantages of Palestine come largely from its position on the Mediterranean coast. Commercially it belongs to the European Area. Palestine stands in an important strategic position between Europe and the budding industrial development, not so much of Palestine itself as of the lands behind Palestine, Arab lands which are entering on a new economic era. One Zionist proponent estimates the immediate background which Palestine might serve as 40 million in number, with a remoter region of 400 million people. All this region will need is outside financing; whose finance is it to be? And what control will go with the financing? If the future economic importance of Palestine is to be, as I surmise, commercial rather than agricultural or industrial, its prosperity will depend to a large extent on its relations to this growingly important hinterland. And vice versa, the prosperity of that hinterland might depend to a considerable extent on its relations with the financial powers, the warehouses, and the commercial lanes centering in Palestine and vicinity.

The significance of these facts is not obscure to the Zionist. It is also not obscure to the Arab, desirous of being master of his own industrial future; desirous therefore of keeping his direct front on the Mediter-

anean, and access on equal terms to the facilities of Palestinian harbors, roads and air stations. Cultural relations with Europe will also be important for the new life of the Arabian provinces. Surrender of Palestine to exclusive Zionist control would thus amount to acceptance of a barrier between them and Europe at the outset of their newer national career.

And when Zionists' plans are extended, as they are by some, to bring Transjordan into the Jewish commonwealth, it must not be forgotten that the Zionist land-bloc would then cut clear through the thin Fertile Crescent to the desert. It would lie directly across the north-and-south lines of land travel and pilgrimage, including the railroad built chiefly for the convenience of pilgrims between the northern Moslem lands and Mecca. This would revive, within Arabian territory, that nightmare of European politics, the Corridor. To ask for Palestine and Transjordan as a minute percentage of the total Arab territory is thus like asking for a microscopic section across one's wrist.

The disconcerting thing about these proposals, to which the United States is asked to become a party, is not so much the rivalry of interests, which is a usual thing in the world, as the silence of Zionist spokesmen about the existence of any such Arab interests. They do not mention the Arab political aspirations, which like their own, have the sanction and documentary support of Great Britain. They tend to blackwash the cultural achievements and interests of the Arab peoples, whom they prefer to represent as typified by the Bedouin rather than by members of the Arab Academy at Damascus or the scholars of Beirut, and whom they describe even in literature now being circulated among us as "nomadic," "backward," "half-civilized." Do they not know the new Arab university life, the new literature, the new history, the new economic prowess? Do they forget that it was the Arabs who for six hundred years preserved the classical culture of Greece for a dark Europe?

And do they not know that just as they themselves are making beginnings in Palestine, so the Arab peoples in far greater numbers are making *their* new beginnings, after four centuries of oppression by the old Turkish regime? Mr. Lowdermilk, who will not be accused of over-enthusiasm for the Arab future, testifies to the rapid progress of an *unsubsidized* Arab agriculture (*Palestine, Land of Promise*, pp. 158 f.) and industry, about 2,000 industrial plants having been started by them in recent years (*op. cit.*, p. 109) in Palestine alone. The young Arab world of today is living, as human beings should live, largely in the future. Its nationalism has to win its own steadiness, self-control, and world-responsibility; but its substance is a justified faith in what is to be, rather than fixing its eyes on what is.

If the Zionists do not know of these things, it is high time they learned

of them. And if they do know of them, why do they so constantly speak and act as if they were not true? This failure on their part to appreciate what it is that they would push aside gives, I think, the clue to the emotional aspect of the Palestinian problem.

For given this temper of disparagement, can anyone explain to the American public why the Arabs should welcome the prospect of becoming dependent for their own progress in any degree on Zionist understanding and good-will?

It is not the bad *effendis*—who serve the Zionist spokesmen as the sufficient explanation of all opposition to their plans—it is not the land-owners and the moneyed muftis alone, it is the entire Arab population of Palestine and the neighboring territories that cannot accommodate its mind to that prospect.

And we are asked to make a national commitment to the cause of political Zionism—I fear with our eyes half shut—a commitment whose consequences would be not alone an added tension in a situation already strained by the demands of war, but a revulsion against everything Anglo-American on the part of the Moslem world, already half inclined to seek the guarantors of its destiny elsewhere.

I speak with all consideration when I say that I believe the political Zionists at this moment as distinct from the cultural Zionists who have built the noble Hebrew University and who know what a National Home must be—I believe the political Zionists to be the chief enemies of the cause of Zionism as well as of the Jewish interests in the world of tomorrow. What can they hope to gain by extricating their brethren from the prejudices of Europe only to build a community in Palestine which has to be protected by Western force (and if we intervene, then by American force also) because it is cradled in an environment of distrust and fear cultivated by their own methods of realizing a misplaced nationalistic ambition?

[Reprinted by the kind permission of League of American-Arab Committees for Democracy, 1907 Detroit Street, Flint, Mich.]

VI

THE VOICE OF THE ARABS

BY JABIR SHIBLI

PROFESSOR OF MATHEMATICS, PENNSYLVANIA STATE COLLEGE

THE PALESTINE PROBLEM is the creation of political Zionism and British imperialism. The Balfour Declaration is the child of this unholy alliance. The promise of the Arabs of Palestine as a national home for the Jews is the betrayal of a people who had been promised independence and encouraged to revolt against the Turks and aid the Allies, and who had raised an army of seventy thousand Arabs which formed the right wing of the Allied forces that conquered Palestine and Syria. The Arabs have not accepted and never will accept the Balfour Declaration or the mandate status. Britain had no right to give away a property not her own, nor had the Zionists a better right to accept an illegitimate gift that could not be delivered.

Political and secular Zionism has been one of the forces of darkness in the world, destructive of Jewry and Araby alike. When Zionist leaders took it upon themselves to commit their movement to the conquest of Palestine by aid of the sword, and entered the arena of international intrigue by making a political alliance with Britain, they betrayed the Jewish people.

Since political Zionism made the Jews of all the world virtual or potential citizens of a Jewish state to be established in Palestine by ousting another nation already in possession, the Jews in other countries have been accused of seeking two citizenships and cherishing two allegiances. The deplorable increase of anti-Semitism all over the world, including Britain and America, is a vague response of the world's feeling to the attitude of political Zionism. For the human spirit detests aggression whether practiced by Hitler in Europe, by Japan in China, or by Zionism in Palestine.

Political Zionism has not only stirred up old hatreds but has also made new enemies for the Jews. The Arabs have no race prejudice or inherent dislike for the Jews, and Arab history is remarkably free from any deliberate persecution of the Jewish people. When medieval Christendom persecuted the Jews, the Arabs gave them refuge and kind hos-

pitality. Before World War I there was no safer place for the Jews than in Arab countries. Zionism is transforming the Arabs from old friends into bitter enemies.

For twenty-five years political Zionism has been a force making for the exploitation of Palestine and the disintegration of the life of its Arab inhabitants. It has poured into tiny Palestine half a million Jews who entered the country not as refugees seeking a home but as conquerors. It has acquired, with the backing of British military force and a large share of the wealth of the world, the most fertile areas of Palestine and made them the inalienable property of the Jewish people. It has dislodged thousands of Arab families from lands which they had cultivated for generations and sucked them into the cities where they work long hours for bad wages and live in miserable huts built of flattened tin cans. It has organized a closed and exclusive community in which no Arab may be employed, but where only Jews will produce and only Jews will profit. It has misrepresented to a scandalous degree Arab life and character, calling the Arabs an "uncivilized race," "bedouins" and "red Indians." And it has created a perpetual menace not only to Palestine but also to Syria, Iraq and Transjordan and the whole Arab world.

In the face of this black record and these stubborn facts that cannot be honestly denied, it is an added insult to tell the Arabs that the Zionist enterprise is a benefit to them. Whatever progress may have been made by the Arabs of Palestine has been made not because of Zionism but in spite of Zionism. The Zionists have done absolutely nothing to create confidence in Zionist honor and intentions. To the Arab mind economic benefits, if any, are overshadowed by the moral and vital issues that cannot be compromised. The Arabs would rather be starving and free than be fed as hewers of wood for alien masters.

Conscious of their great background and inspired by a new national awakening, quick with the promise of a more brilliant future, the Arabs are immovably united in defense of their sacred heritage. It is a delusion and misrepresentation of reality to think that the Arab revolt is due to the intrigues of the *effendi* class, the personal ambitions of the Grand Mufti, or the agents of Germany and Italy. It is the revolt of a proud and highly gifted people whose land has been invaded by military force but whose affection for their country is so passionate that they would rather die fighting in its defense than go elsewhere and live. Justice and the future are on their side. Should the million Arabs of Palestine be overwhelmed by foreign powers, the coming Arab union, which will have fifty million people before the end of the present century, will take up the cause and redeem the heart and center of the Arab world from alien invaders. The worst blunder of Zionism is that it underrated the strength of the Arabs and their unconquerable spirit.

Although Britain has served Zionism against the rights and welfare of the Arabs, twenty-five years of the Zionist experiment and the uncompromising opposition of the Arabs to Jewish domination have made it clear that a national home based on territorial sovereignty cannot be accomplished without constant use of military force. It was this realism that forced Britain to decide against the establishment of a Jewish state and against any further Jewish immigration into Palestine without the consent of the Arabs. When the Zionists found that their extreme demands were reduced to a limited Zionism, they accused Britain of "bad faith" and turned to America for support. They would have America involved in the hatreds and disputes generated by Zionism. But neither America nor the United Nations have any more right to give Palestine to the Zionists than the Arabs have to give New York to the Jews or Massachusetts to the Irish.

More recently another group has been created; namely, the "Christian Council on Palestine." When men speak in the name of a "Christian" body, the world has a right to expect words of justice, love and reconciliation. Instead, spokesmen of the Christian Council seem to be calling for a Protestant crusade in behalf of Zionism (not to lift up the banner of the Cross on the hill of Calvary, but to raise the star of David over the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the Dome of the Rock). Perhaps these Christian gentlemen are not aware that there are 130,000 Christian Arabs in Palestine and two million Christian Arabs in the Near East who are wholeheartedly united with the Moslem Arabs in the defense of their country. The Christian Arabs are the children of the early Church, and they have a right to expect at least sympathy from the Christian brotherhood in America. Try to imagine how it would feel to a Christian Arab, or to a Moslem Arab, to learn that Christian clergymen and politicians are offering his country to others. How can our missionaries proclaim the gospel of love among the Arabs while the honorable members of the Christian Council conspire with the Jews to rob those same Arabs of their freedom and their native land? It is the height of impertinence, if not hypocrisy, to say that while Palestine is to be converted into a Jewish state, "the rights of the Arabs must be fully considered." To fight anti-Semitism is the duty of every civilized human being, but that duty could never be fulfilled by dispossessing or submerging the Arabs.

If "the Jewish problem is a Christian problem," honesty demands that Christians should solve it with what is their own, not with what belongs to the Arabs. It would be more becoming if spokesmen of the Christian Council would use their eloquence to arouse the conscience of Christian nations to give the hapless Jews asylum in the vast domains of America, Canada, Brazil, South Africa, Australia and the boundless

pendent nations can be provisionally recognized, subject to the rendering of administrative advice and assistance by a Mandatory, until such time as they are able to stand alone. The wishes of these communities must be a principal consideration in the selection of a Mandatory.

This provision of the League Covenant is on the lines of the twelfth of President Wilson's Fourteen Points. It stated:

... the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development.

The independence of Arab Palestine, in which the Arabs numbered nearly 90% of the population at the outbreak of the First World War, might seem to be sufficiently secured by the Mandatory provisions of the League Covenant. It had, however, still further security in the eyes of the Arabs, owing to the promises contained in the McMahon letters, which have formed the subject of much contentious debate. That correspondence was carried on in the autumn and winter of 1915-16 between Sir Henry McMahon, then High Commissioner for Egypt, on behalf of the British Government, and the King of the Hejaz, Sharif of Mecca. At that time the military outlook in the Near East was bad, and the British Government wished to have the help of the Arabs against the Turkish forces. Sir Henry McMahon, therefore, promised King Hussein the independence of those areas of the Turkish Empire populated by Arabs, with certain exceptions, in return for armed assistance by the Arabs. Palestine was not mentioned by name in the correspondence. The British Government maintains that it was included in the excepted area, the Arabs that it was not, that certain areas were excepted on the ground that in them France had an interest. She had no special interest in Palestine, but was deeply concerned about northern Syria. Nor was there any other obvious reason for the exception of Palestine from the agreement, as the Balfour Declaration was made nearly two years after the McMahon correspondence had closed. It is clear that in this important correspondence phrases were used which led to serious misunderstanding, and it may well be doubted whether the Arabs would have taken part in the revolt in the desert, had they realized that the British Government had excepted Palestine from the area in which they were promised eventual independence.

The wording of the McMahon correspondence was unfortunate. Not less remarkable was the wording of the Balfour Declaration. This document was issued in the form of a letter dated November 2, 1917,

addressed to Lord Rothschild and signed by Mr. A. J. Balfour, at the time Foreign Secretary. It runs:

I have much pleasure in conveying to you, on behalf of His Majesty's Government, the following declaration of sympathy with Jewish Zionist aspirations, which has been submitted to and approved by the Cabinet.

"His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people, and will use their best endeavours to facilitate the achievement of this object, it being clearly understood that nothing should be done which may prejudice the civil and religious rights of existing non-Jewish communities in Palestine, or the rights and political status enjoyed by Jews in any other country."

I should be grateful if you would bring this Declaration to the knowledge of the Zionist Federation.

It is noticeable that the letter contains no description of the "Jewish Zionist aspirations" with which His Majesty's Government was in sympathy, nor any definition of the term "a national home for the Jewish people." No reference was made to political rights in the clause safeguarding other rights of the existing population, and the description of the Arabs, at that time constituting some 90% of the total population of Palestine, as an "existing non-Jewish community in Palestine" was contemptuous and insulting. The last sentence of the latter was humorously superfluous, unless used as a smoke-screen, as it subsequently became known that the Zionists themselves took the major share in drafting the document. The Balfour Declaration must indeed be unique as a State paper, in the obscurity of its phrasing, its gratuitous insulting reference to a people who at the time were the allies of Great Britain, and its careful concealment of the ultimate object to which His Majesty's Government at the time hoped to attain.

The Mandatories for the ex-Turkish Arab dominions were nominated at the San Remo Conference in April, 1920, Iraq and Palestine falling to Great Britain, without any reference to the inhabitants as was required by Clause 4 of Article 22 of the Covenant. But peace with Turkey had not been concluded, and Palestine was actually in military occupation, which normally should have continued till the ratification of the Peace Treaty. Nor could the Mandate be conferred by the League till peace had been concluded, that is, until the Treaty of Lausanne, signed in July, 1923, had been ratified by the governments concerned. The British Government did not await the normal procedure, but on July 1, 1920, replaced the military government of Palestine by a

civil administration under Sir Herbert (now Viscount) Samuel as High Commissioner. Steps were at once taken to implement the promises contained in the Balfour Declaration and the immigration of Jews was encouraged, the first Immigration Ordinance being enacted in September, 1920, and the first year's quota of immigrants being fixed at 12,500.

This action caused considerable alarm among the Arab population, and on Mayday, 1921, a clash occurred between Arabs and Jews in Tel Aviv and Jaffa. The trouble was quickly suppressed. A Commission of Enquiry reported that the cause of the disorders was Arab hostility connected with Jewish immigration and with their conception of Zionist policy as derived from Jewish exponents. This was the first of many disturbances, first directed against Jewish immigrants, later against both Jews and the Mandatory authority, and finally, from 1936 until the outbreak of the Second World War, taking the form of widespread rebellion against the Mandatory government of Palestine.

The Mandate came into force on September 29, 1923, and the position of the Mandatory government was thus regularized. The terms of the Mandate deserve attention. It is a document of 28 articles, but of them only a few are of special importance in considering the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine. The Preamble embodies the salient part of the Balfour Declaration and the statement

whereas recognition has thereby been given to the historical connection of the Jewish people with Palestine and to the grounds for reconstituting their national home in that country.

Article 1 gave to the Mandatory full powers of legislation and administration. Article 2 rendered the Mandatory responsible for conditions which would secure the establishment of the Jewish national home

and also for safeguarding the civil and religious rights of all the inhabitants of Palestine, irrespective of race or religion.

Article 4 provided for an appropriate Jewish agency to be recognized as a public body, to advise and cooperate with the Administration in matters affecting the establishment of the Jewish national home. Article 6 was of particular importance:

The Administration of Palestine, while ensuring that the rights and position of other sections of the population are not prejudiced, shall facilitate Jewish immigration under suitable conditions, and shall encourage, in co-operation with the Jewish agency referred to in Article 4, close settlement by the Jews on the land, including state lands and waste lands not required for public purposes.

It is difficult—indeed impossible—to reconcile the provisions of this Mandate with those contained in the Covenant of the League of Nations, under which it purported to be issued, which laid down that the well-being and development of the inhabitants of Palestine at the time of its occupation form a sacred trust for civilization, and that they could be provisionally recognized as an independent nation, subject to the rendering of advice and assistance by a Mandatory. It is on these grounds, among others, that the Arab population has, from the earliest days of the Mandate, claimed that the Mandate is devoid of authority. They feel that Great Britain is exercising a Mandate, not on behalf of the population of Palestine, but on behalf of a foreign power—the Zionist organization of the world. They have seen that power pouring Jewish immigrants into Palestine by the tens of thousands, purchasing very large areas of land hitherto held by Arabs, holding it under conditions which preclude resale, and leasing it only to Jews, and even to them only on condition that none but a Jew may be employed on the land so leased. It is no matter for wonder that the Arab community of Palestine lives in a state of constant fear of the possible conditions of an unknown future.

The Jewish settlements in Palestine have been a remarkable achievement. Most attention has been drawn to the agricultural settlements. These have been widely advertised, possibly in view of the insistence in Article 6 of the Mandate that close settlement by Jews on the land should be encouraged, possibly also, in part, because the romance and adventure inherent in these settlements are a stimulus to generous support of the movement. The emphasis placed on this branch of the work of the Zionist organization is, however, disproportionate. As is pointed out in the Report of the Royal Commission, "the proportion of workers on the land (earnings) to the Jewish population . . . today is 6.4%."¹ The great mass of the Jewish immigrants are not workers on the land, but residents of the towns. The population of one town, Tel Aviv, far exceeds in number the total population of all the agricultural settlements. This is not to say that the Jewish settlements are unimportant. They are the very remarkable result of the combined application of outstanding technical skill, abounding energy and practically unlimited resources provided by the generosity of Jewish communities in many lands. But the great majority of the Jewish population of Palestine today consists of skilled and unskilled workers in industry and on public works, industrialists, tradesmen, persons living on their private resources and professional men of all types. The number in these last two classes is very large, and in some directions that of professional

¹ Cmd. 5479, p. 115.

men is out of all proportion to the needs of the community. Evidence was tendered to the Royal Commission that in Tel Aviv there was one doctor to every 161 persons, in Palestine as a whole one doctor for every 560 persons, while in the United Kingdom there is one doctor for about 1,085 persons.

Industrial development is an essential to the prosperity of the Jewish section of the population, which has grown from 55,000 in 1918² to at least 500,000 at the present time. In 1942 the value of the output of industrial workers was £30,000,000. Apart from war supplies, iron and steel articles, textiles, leather goods, foodstuffs, chemicals and pharmaceutical preparations, drainage pipes and glass, essential oils and lorries were produced by Jewish industry in Palestine.³ This phenomenal development has been due to three main causes—the provision of cheap capital by what Professor Bentwich describes as “philanthropic—capitalist instruments,” protection of industry by carefully regulated tariffs, and the important monopoly for the production of electric power and light granted by the government to Mr. Pinhas Rutenberg, a Russian Jewish engineer, and now exploited by the Palestine Electric Corporation. Some of the conditions of this monopolistic concession are remarkable, not least the postponement of payment of customs duty on imported material “until the profits of the Company, after writing off amortization, depreciation and reserve, are first sufficient to enable the Company to pay a dividend of at least 8% per annum tax free.”⁴

For the years 1920-1936 the principle of “economic absorptive capacity” governed the number of immigrant Jews on the Labor schedule. This principle was first laid down in the Churchill Memorandum of June 3, 1922.⁵ “This immigration cannot be so great in volume as to exceed whatever may be the economic capacity of the country at the time to absorb new arrivals.” It was reaffirmed in the letter dated February 13, 1931, from the Prime Minister, Mr. Ramsay MacDonald to Dr. Weizmann,⁶ which the Prime Minister described as “the authoritative interpretation of the White Paper.”⁷ In that letter it was stated that the criterion which would guide the Government in fixing the number of Jewish immigrants would be the principle of economic absorptive capacity. It is, however, clear that if philanthropic capital is available, irrespective of profit, electric power in quantity at very low cost, and protection by means of tariffs and exemption from taxation, industry could be artificially expanded to great dimensions, and “ab-

² *Great Britain and Palestine, 1915-1936*. R.I.I.A., p. 24.

³ N. Bentwich, *Judaea lives again*, pp. 58 to 61.

⁴ Quoted in Jeffries, *Palestine: the Reality*, p. 434.

⁵ *The Times*, February 14, 1931.

⁶ Cmd. 1700 of 1922.

⁷ Cmd. 3692 of 1930.

sorptive capacity” provided for very large numbers of Jewish immigrants. It would indeed be in the power of the Zionist organizations so to manipulate “absorptive capacity” as, in their judgment, circumstances might require.

This question was considered with care by the Palestine Royal Commission, which pointed out the dangers inherent in the application of that principle alone. They gave their reasons for reaching the conclusion that political and psychological factors should also be taken into account in determining the numbers in the Labor schedule, and that a “political high level” should be fixed at 12,000 per annum for the next five years.⁸ The importance of the decision and its effect on the development of the National Home may be judged from the fact that in the period from the beginning of 1933 to August, 1936, the number of Jewish immigrants exceeded 156,000—a figure much greater than the total of recorded Jewish immigration from 1920 to 1932 inclusive.⁹ The reason for this remarkable movement in the year 1933 and succeeding years is to be found in events in Germany. The Nuremberg legislation to safeguard the purity of the German race and the abominable treatment of the Jews in Germany under the Nazi régime resulted in a mass movement of refugees from that country, and Palestine came to be regarded as the chief haven of refuge for German, and later also for Austrian Jews. As anti-Semitism spread in its more acute forms to other areas of Europe, that position became even more important, and great pressure was exerted on the Palestine Government and on the Government of the United Kingdom to open the door to Palestine still wider. In view of the refusal of other countries to admit refugees save in inadequate numbers, the demand was natural, but it ran counter to the policy recommended by the Royal Commission and subsequently adopted by the British Government. In the years 1937 to 1942 inclusive, the number of immigrant Jews was 50,197.

The immigration of the Jews into Palestine has been conducted with outstanding ability. The Jewish Agency and the National Federation of Labor (*Histadruth*) have organized the recruitment, transport and settlement of those admitted on the Labor schedule, with amazing success. Criticism has been made in the past by the orthodox section of Jewry in Palestine that politics rather than religious devotion have been considered by the recruiting authorities, and it is, in fact, remarkable that, whereas in the older settlements which were founded before the time of the Balfour Declaration the synagogue was the center of the village life, in the later settlements that position is occupied by the vil-

⁸ Cmd. 5479 of 1937, pp. 300 and 306.

⁹ See *Great Britain and Palestine—1915-1936*. R.I.I.A., pp. 62 et seq.

lage school. Politics are now far more obvious than religious enthusiasm, and, to quote Dr. Toynbee, Zionism is "in essence a secular, economic-political expression of Jewish national aspirations." The Zionist movement today is definitely an urge of political nationalism, and the Jewish settlement is no longer regarded as a settlement of Palestinian Jews in Palestine—if it were ever so regarded—but of national Jews in Eretz Israel. Therein lies the tragic impossibility of reconciliation between immigrant Jew and aboriginal Arab.

Judging by recorded statements of Zionist leaders it is fair to conclude that, at the outset, the policy of Zionism did not aim at political dominance in Palestine. At the tenth Zionist Congress, held at Basle in August, 1911, the President made a statement, from which the following is extracted:

Only those suffering from gross ignorance or actuated by malice, could accuse us of the desire of establishing an independent Jewish Kingdom. . . . *The aim of Zionism is the erection for the Jewish people of a publicly recognized, legally secured home in Palestine.* Not a Jewish State, but a home in the ancient land of our forefathers where we can live a Jewish life without oppression and persecution. What we demand is that the Jewish immigrant to Palestine be given the opportunity of naturalizing as a citizen without limitation and that he can live unhindered in accordance with Jewish customs . . . that and nothing else is our aim.¹⁰

In the introduction to his *History of Zionism*—written during 1918, Mr. Sokolov, at that time President of the Zionist Organization, wrote:

It has been said, and is still being obstinately repeated by anti-Zionists again and again, that Zionism aims at the creation of an independent "Jewish State." But this is wholly fallacious. The "Jewish State" was never a part of the Zionist programme.

Dr. Weizmann is reported to have declared at a meeting of Government officials in Palestine held on April 27, 1918:

All fears expressed openly or secretly by the Arabs that they are to be ousted from their present position are due either to a fundamental misconception of Zionist aims or to the malicious activities of our common enemies.¹¹

Finally Dr. Weizmann in an address to the Zionist organization in 1931, of which he was then President, said:

¹⁰ Quoted in *Jewish-Arab Affairs*. Jerusalem, June, 1931, pp. 7 and 8.

¹¹ *Palestine*, May 18, 1918.

The Arabs must be made to feel, by deed as well as word, that, whatever the future numerical relationships of the two nations in Palestine, we on our part contemplate no political domination. But they must also remember that we on our side will never submit to any political domination.¹²

That principle was also adopted by the British government, and was announced, before the Mandate was actually granted by the Council of the League of Nations, in the Churchill Memorandum of June 3, 1922.¹³ It included the following sentences:

Unauthorized statements have been made to the effect that the purpose in view is to create a wholly Jewish Palestine. Phrases have been used such as that Palestine is to become "as Jewish as England is English." His Majesty's Government regard any such expectation as impracticable and have no such aim in view. Nor have they at any time contemplated . . . the disappearance or the subordination of the Arabic population, language or culture in Palestine. They would draw attention to the fact that the terms of the [Balfour] Declaration referred to do not contemplate that Palestine as a whole should be converted into a Jewish National Home, but that such a home should be founded *in Palestine*. . . .

Had the Jewish authorities been content with the original object of settlement in Palestine—"a Jewish life without oppression and persecution" in accordance with Jewish customs, the national home would have presented no difficulty. The Jews could have entered and settled as so many did in the P.I.C.A. settlements—founded in many cases long before the Balfour Declaration—in friendly relationship with their Arab fellow-citizens, and themselves loyal citizens of Palestine. The unfortunate fact is that the Jewish immigration today is not composed of Jews who, on religious grounds, wish to return to the land of Zion, in order to lead a Jewish life, without oppression and persecution, in accordance with Jewish customs. Rather is it composed of Jews, largely devoid of religious conviction, animated by a spirit of political nationalism, and determined to secure domination in Palestine, the homeland of the Arab for at least 1,300 years. No effort has been made to coalesce with the existing population. On the contrary, there is extreme divergence between the virile occidentalism of the immigrant and the conservative orientalism of the mass of the resident population. After its description of the organization of Jewish policy in Palestine the Royal Commission writes: "it would be difficult to find in history a

¹² Quoted in Bentwich—*Judaea lives again*, p. 141.

¹³ Cmd. 1700 of 1922.

precedent for the establishment of so distinct an *imperium in imperio*."¹⁴

The policy of His Majesty's Government for the future government of Palestine is that contained in the Statement of Policy issued in May, 1939.¹⁵ It was issued after consultations with Jewish and Arab representatives, including among the latter representatives of Egypt, Iraq, Saudi Arabia and the Yemen. The salient feature of this White Paper is the decision to limit the further immigration of Jews into Palestine to 75,000 in the five years from 1939; after that period no further immigration of Jews will be permitted unless the Arabs of Palestine are prepared to acquiesce in it. In other words, at long last the British Government has recognized that Palestine is an Arab land, and that it shall remain an Arab land unless the Arabs decide otherwise. The second most important point regards the future constitution of the Palestine State:

at the end of five years from the restoration of peace and order, an appropriate body representative of the people of Palestine and of His Majesty's Government will be set up to review the working of the constitutional arrangement during the transitional period, and to consider and make recommendations regarding the constitution of the independent Palestine State.¹⁶

The intention of the British Government is that within ten years Palestine shall be an independent state in Treaty relations with Great Britain. Inevitably the majority in that State will be Arabs, but the Jewish population of the national home in Palestine will be a forceful and well disciplined minority. If they are prepared to accept that position and to live in Palestine as loyal Palestinian citizens, their influence will be very great, and the advance of Palestine will be rapid. If they refuse to cooperate, they will doubtless be able to make things difficult for the Palestine Government, without gain to themselves.

In view of the latest statement of policy by His Majesty's Government, the position and authority of the Jewish Agency in Palestine will not be required in the interest of the national home, now securely established. The existence of that authority has emphasized the apartness of the Jewish section of the Palestinian population in the past, and has also led to a suspicion on the part of the Arab population that the interests of the Jews were more forcefully represented than those of the Arabs for the consideration of the Palestine Government. The Royal Commission recorded its opinion that among the factors causing

the outbreaks of violence on the part of the Arabs was the Arab belief that

the Jews can always get their way by means denied to the Arabs. . . . Based in general on the status of the Jewish Agency both in Jerusalem and in London, this belief was greatly strengthened by the publication of Mr. MacDonald's letter to Dr. Weizmann in 1931. . . .¹⁷

In future the representation of Jewish interests in Palestine may very safely be left to the local organizations which are staffed by able men, and to the High Commissioner and his government. There is no possibility of a coalescence of the Jewish and Arab sections of the population so long as the former are in a specially privileged position in relation to the Palestine Government.

Though Palestine may properly be regarded as the spiritual home of every devout Jew, there is no proper ground to conclude that it is the haven of refuge for Jews unjustly persecuted. The solution to persecution in Europe is to prevent it. If that be impossible, the havens of refuge should be in those countries, such as Great Britain, the United States of America, and the U.S.S.R., among others, who sympathize with the sufferers and have a sense of the dignity of man as man. It is unfair and indeed hypocritical to express sympathy, while refusing to accept the sufferers into one's own country and compelling their acceptance in Palestine, where they are not welcomed. Were the doors of Great Britain, the United States, the U.S.S.R. and France thrown open, the problem of persecuted Jewry would be immediately solved.

"The best service which well wishers of the National Home can render it, is to recognize frankly that the situation in Palestine has reached a deadlock and to bend their minds to finding a way out."¹⁸ The way out is indicated in the Statement of Policy of 1939.

¹⁷ Cmd. 5479 of 1937, p. 111.

¹⁸ Cmd. 5479 of 1937, p. 125.

[Reprinted from *The Fortnightly*, December, 1944, by the kind permission of the author]

¹⁴ Cmd. 5479 of 1937, pp. 48 and 49.

¹⁵ Cmd. 6019 of 1939.

¹⁶ Cmd. 6019 of 1939, p. 7.

VIII

A LETTER BY THE HONORABLE J. W. BAILEY

UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM NORTH CAROLINA
TO
GREENSBORO COMMITTEE FOR THE ABROGATION OF
THE WHITE PAPER
RELATING TO
JEWISH IMMIGRATION INTO PALESTINE

*Mr. Fred G. Rypins, Greensboro Committee for the Abrogation of the
White Paper, Greensboro, North Carolina*

Dear Mr. Rypins:

I thank you for the letter signed by yourself and a number of other citizens for whom I have a high regard. I wish to reply, but I must say that it is impossible for me to fully discuss important matters by mail. I am writing briefly.

The thing that gives me most concern is the fact that our Jewish fellow citizens and their friends are participating in a movement to create a Jewish pressure group in our country for the purpose of bringing about changes in the policy of other nations. It is my view that the American people have nothing to do with the internal affairs of other nations. We have no rights in the matter of immigration in Palestine nor do we have rights with respect to the White Paper.

We have nothing to do whatever with the immigration policy in Palestine or in any other country except our own. We deny the right of other countries to bring pressure upon us with respect to immigration and it is our duty to refrain from doing so with respect to other nations what we would not have other nations do to us. It is a matter for the British to determine. So far as the present controversy is concerned, we are not parties to the White Paper nor are we parties to the Treaty of Versailles.

I have been greatly concerned by evidence of a rising tide of antipathy to the Jews in our country. I wish to avoid anything like an anti-Jewish movement here. I defended the Jews against the Ku Klux and I do not wish to see Ku Klux persecution or any other sort of persecution

started here. But if the Jews put forward a group movement they may rest assured that there will be a counter movement and it will be quite fearful.

The Jews should not set the example nor provide the provocation for a counter Jewish movement in this country. If they should do this the situation for them would be much worse than they now imagine. We ought not to have racial or religious pressure groups of any sort in this country. The Jew is an American citizen. He has the right of petition. But in the absence of a wrong by this country to the Jews as a race or group, a Jewish movement ought not be formed, for the reason that such a movement will be the provocation for a counter movement, if for no other reason.

All the stronger is this consideration in view of the fact that we are now at war and national unity is indispensable.

The object in view with respect to the Wagner resolution and the movement to abrogate the White Paper is the same. Should the White Paper be abrogated, promptly upon the end of the war there will be a migration to Palestine, which would upset the balance there. I agree that the movement to abrogate the White Paper is not as definite as the Wagner resolution but they are a part of one whole. I might say that if there is a difference it is a difference between the camel's nose and the camel—and at any rate each group contemplates a Jewish group for purposes of propaganda and agitation in this country concerning foreign policy and relating to the rights of other nations.

We have protests here now from five nations against the Wagner resolutions and the matter has become so serious that the Chief of Staff of the United States has appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate. I do not think that General Marshall would have appeared without the approval of the Commander in Chief, that is the President.

Representations have been made to me by an officer representing the State Department as to the seriousness of this situation. We cannot afford to irritate the Moslem world. We cannot afford to antagonize Egypt and the Arabs, and the Jews ought not ask us to do anything that would irritate these nations. Good relations with them at this time are indispensable to our war effort. Agitation in America for the abrogation of the White Paper would be no less irritating than agitation for the passage of the Wagner-Taft resolution.

I totally disagree with you in your statement that what you are attempting to bring about is an essential feature of the thing for which we are waging this war. We are not waging this war in order to provide immigration to Palestine for the Jews nor are we waging this war in order to establish a Jewish state in Palestine. We are waging this war

because we have it to do to defend our country, and in order that we may wage it successfully we must not necessarily make enemies. I do not think any American soldier will say that he is fighting in order to encourage the migration of Jews to Palestine, or in order to erect a Jewish commonwealth.

Turn the picture around and imagine Great Britain demanding that we shall open up New Mexico or California or North Carolina to immigration of the Jews from Europe. It can not be contended that there is less room here than there is in Palestine.

But the main consideration is that since the United States has entered upon its international destiny the American people must learn that they have no rights whatever respecting the internal affairs of other nations. I have observed the agitation about India. India is not an American affair.

Suppose the British should set up an agitation as to the conduct of affairs in Alaska and should demand that we open up Alaska to the people of India or the people of Russia. Somehow we have gotten ourselves into the belief that we can start agitation here concerning the conduct of other nations and the administration of their affairs. Unless we can get rid of that sort of thing it would be better for us to become isolationists although I consider that impossible.

These are my views. I readily grant you your right to have different views. I feel sure you will grant me the right to the views which I am herein setting out and to which I have been driven by very careful study.

While we are thinking about our friendly feeling for our fellow citizens who are Jewish, let us consider that we have a duty to ourselves with respect to Syria, Lebanon, Transjordan, Iraq, Arabia and Egypt. It is immensely important at the present moment that we should do nothing to offend the Moslem world. They occupy a great territory indispensable to our success in the war effort. The American Jews ought not to ask us to make enemies of our nation of the inhabitants of these countries.

Let me add that I know that every movement here either for the abrogation of the White Paper or for the establishment of a Jewish state in Palestine is at once spread throughout the Moslem world by our German enemies and very greatly to our prejudice in the present extreme emergency. Should the Jews succeed in bringing about a state of irritation on this subject and the war be prolonged on that account with the cost of life involved, the reaction here would be something that the Jews would always regret.

With best wishes.

Very truly yours,

J. W. BAILEY

March 18, 1944.

IX

A LETTER BY ROGER H. SOLTAU

PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL SCIENCE,
AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF BEIRUT, LEBANON

WRITTEN IN REPLY TO
PROPOSALS MADE IN A LETTER TO THE *New York Times* RELATIVE TO
PALESTINE BY DR. JUDAH L. MAGNES

TO THE EDITOR
THE NEW YORK TIMES

Sir:

Any statement by Dr. Magnes will always command the earnest attention of students of Palestinian affairs. For some twenty years many of them have kept on hoping that his voice might finally prevail in Jewish councils, and bring about the abandonment of a political Zionism that makes Jews and Arabs rival claimants for the possession and control of Palestine, in favor of the more purely and non-competitive cultural concept of a Jewish National Home in that country.

To many of us, therefore, the letter of Dr. Magnes in the *Times* of February 17 will have come as something of a shock. The suggestion for a parity that would make of Palestine neither a Jewish nor an Arab state, but one under the perpetual tutelage of a Middle East Regional Council, is one that runs counter to all prevailing trends of both Arab and Zionist opinion, and it is surprising to find so well-informed a person as Dr. Magnes so confident that it can be acceptable to both parties. The writer has no reason to think that things have changed much in this respect since he left the Middle East last June, and many years' residence in that part of the world, including frequent visits to Palestine, where he has many friends among both Arabs and Jews, make him feel certain that the parity-tutelage policy has no chance of acceptance. Why indeed should the Arab accept it? To him, Palestine is an Arab land. His claim to it rests, like that of the Jew, on conquest followed by an occupation and settlement both longer in time

and more thorough in extent than that of ancient Israel. The Mandate policy forced on him the acceptance, under constant protest, of a Jewish immigration which may have brought some material benefits, but has rudely broken into the traditional harmony of his civilization. To the Arab, the Jews are aliens, intruders, who have no more rights to Palestine on the ground of previous occupation two thousand years ago than the present-day Italians have to England or France as descendants of the Roman conquerors. Nor indeed have any other powers the right to dispose, in favor of the Jews or of anybody else, of a Palestine which is not theirs to give away. The Balfour Declaration is therefore "binding" on no one, either in law or in morals.

The Arabs are, however, reluctantly willing to make the best of an unfortunate situation and accept the presence of a permanent Jewish minority, as long as it is a minority in an Arab State linked on to other Arab countries; nor would they object to the security of this minority being guaranteed by the United Nations organization of which Palestine would be a member. They welcomed the British White Paper of 1939 as recognition by the British Government that the essential purpose of the Balfour Declaration had been fulfilled, that there *was* a Jewish National Home in Palestine, but that no further extension of the Jewish population could be envisaged without jeopardizing the welfare of the very Arabs whose rights had been safeguarded in the Declaration. But the White Paper marks the limit; beyond its present policy nothing can possibly be accepted by the Arab world, both in and out of Palestine. The homelessness of present-day Jewry is indeed a tragic problem, but the Arab is in no wise responsible for it and does not see why it should be remedied at his sole expense because the Romans expelled the Jews from Palestine two thousand years ago. Jewish homelessness is a world problem, and the sympathy expressed for homeless Jewry in such countries as the United States and Great Britain would prove more impressive to Arab ears if it were accompanied by proposals to receive large contingents of Jewish immigrants in those two countries. One third of Palestine is now Jewish, and at the same rate America should admit eighty-five million and Britain fifteen. But we need not go so far. Dr. Magnes estimates at one and a half million the number of homeless Jews. If the two above-mentioned countries were to receive them all, their total population of 175 millions would only be increased by less than 1%, thirty times less than is even now demanded of the Arabs.

National self-determination may not be the last word in political wisdom, but it is still accepted as the normal principle of international relations, and the sufferings of present-day Jewry cannot, in all good

conscience, be put forward as a reason for denying its application to the Arab world today. Any solution of the Palestinian problem which deprives that country of its right to be an Arab state, either separate or linked with its neighbors, can only mean the perpetuation of unrest and trouble. It will spell insecurity for the Jews and cripple the social and economic development of the whole Middle East. And to those Zionists who would still urge the imposing of a settlement in conformity with their exasperated desires, we would answer with the words spoken to such hotheads by Dr. Magnes himself at a Hebrew University lecture some sixteen years ago: "If we cannot find ways of peace and understanding, if the only way of establishing the Jewish National Home is upon the bayonets of some empire, our whole enterprise is not worth while, and it is better that the Eternal People, that has outlived many a mighty empire, should possess its soul in patience and plan and wait. It is one of the great civilizing tasks before the Jewish people to try to enter the promised land, not in the Joshua way, but bringing peace, and culture, hard work and sacrifice and love, and a determination to do nothing that cannot be justified before the conscience of the world."

ROGER H. SOLTAU

February 21, 1945.

X

A LETTER BY
PHILIP MARSHALL BROWN

AUTHOR AND FORMER PROFESSOR OF INTERNATIONAL LAW
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

TO

THE *New York Herald Tribune*, APRIL 8, 1944,
RELATIVE TO A JEWISH STATE

[Reprinted by the kind permission of the author]

To the New York Herald Tribune:

The sympathies of all decent people must go out to the Jews in their hour of agony. The dispersal of thousands of homeless Jews presents a grave problem for the United Nations, particularly for Great Britain. Our sympathies, however, should not blind us to the facts of the situation. We cannot be of much constructive help unless we do face the facts.

I was in Palestine in 1918 when the first Zionist Commission visited the country. I was there again in 1929. I have made a conscientious study of the problem and believe the essential facts to be as follows:

1. The Balfour Declaration in favor of a "national home" for the Jews in Palestine, issued, like the Emancipation Proclamation by Lincoln, during a war, was definitely and lamentably vague. The interpretation placed on it by the Zionists as meaning a "national state" has created enormous difficulties.

2. Palestine is too small and unproductive to support a considerable immigration except as a highly industrialized state.

3. The establishment of any Jewish state in Palestine, especially a communistic state, would gravely unsettle the whole Middle East.

4. No responsible British official in the Middle East has ever believed that a national Jewish state would be feasible except as created and maintained by British bayonets.

5. The demands now pressed on the British Government to abrogate the White Paper have served to arouse the fury and to consolidate the

whole of the Arabic world in the Middle East against the Jews. They have seriously embarrassed the United Nations in the conduct of the war.

6. These extreme demands have served to arouse latent anti-Semitism everywhere, and notably here in the United States.

7. Many prominent Jews are opposed to Zionist demands and feel gravely concerned over the situation.

Legitimate concern for the successful prosecution of the war and for a generous just treatment of oppressed Jews should make us all the more careful how we should proceed in this hour of trial for all peoples struggling for freedom and a sound international order.

PHILIP MARSHALL BROWN

Washington, D.C., April 5, 1944.

XI

A LETTER BY STUART C. DODD

PROFESSOR OF SOCIOLOGY
AMERICAN UNIVERSITY OF BEIRUT, LEBANON

TO

THE *New York Herald Tribune*, AUGUST 10, 1944,
RELATIVE TO PLANKS ON PALESTINE

[Reprinted by the kind permission of the author]

To the New York Herald Tribune:

In their eagerness to get the Jewish vote both the Republicans and the Democrats have inserted into their platforms a plank which urges unlimited immigration of Jews into Palestine. As America hears the Jewish voice, but seldom hears the Arab side of the case, it may interest fair-minded voters to realize a few consequences of this plank. These consequences are as seen by one who has lived for sixteen years out there with warm friendships among both Jews and Arabs. Also, as the organizer of the only poll of public opinion held in that part of the world, he has been in an unusual position to observe the trends.

1. The Arabs intend again to resist unlimited Jewish immigration with bloodshed, if such immigration is again imposed on them by force. To urge Jewish migration there is to offer Jews, not the security they so urgently need, but a threat of new pogroms. This plank tends towards civil war in Palestine, with America and England taking sides against each other.

2. The international security called for in the platforms is contradicted by this plank. For it tends to convert the present vast Arab good will toward America into bitter resentment and active enmity. Millions of Arabs will see this plank as ruthless imperialism crushing down their rights because of mere expediency in our domestic election. This American imperialism speaks louder to them than our claims to be fighting for freedom. That Americans do not generally see it as imperialism is because America is ignorant of the Arab side of the Zionist controversy.

3. America has a large and increasing stake in the oil fields of Arabia. In so far as we make bitter enemies of the Arabs the Palestinian plank tends towards a future choice before us of losing those oil fields or keeping them with the bayonet and the lives of American soldiers.

The considerations above do not enter into the justice of the controversy between Jews and Arabs. The question raised in this letter is whether the Republicans and Democrats are wise in inviting Jewish votes at a cost of reduced international security by inciting further conflict abroad.

STUART C. DODD

Hartford, Conn., Aug. 8, 1944.

ADDITIONAL READINGS ON PALESTINE

- ANTONIUS, GEORGE: *The Arab Awakening*, the story of the Arab national movement. Philadelphia, Lippincott, 1939.*
- GRANT, ELIHU: *Palestine, Our Holy Land* (pamphlet). Baltimore, 1940.
- : *Palestine Today* (pamphlet). Baltimore, 1938.
- HOCKING, WILLIAM ERNEST: *The Spirit of World Politics*, with special studies of the Near East. New York, Macmillan, 1932.
- JASTROW, MORRIS: *Zionism and the Future of Palestine*, the fallacies and dangers of political Zionism. New York, Macmillan, 1919.*
- JEFFRIES, JOSEPH M. N.: *Palestine: The Reality*. London, New York etc., Longman, Green and Co., 1939.*
- KATIBAH, HABIB I.: *The New Spirit in Arab Lands*, published privately (1940) by the author.
- MALTI, MICHEL G.: "Is Zionism a Solution?" (an article in *The Arab World*, autumn issue, 1944).
- RICHMOND, E. T.: "Dictatorship in the Holy Land" (an article in *Nineteenth Century and After*, February 1938, pp. 186-192).
- SHEEAN, VINCENT: *Personal History* (chapter entitled "Holy Land"), New York Literary Guild, 1935.
- WYSNER, GLORIA M.: *Dilemma in Palestine*. Bulletin issued (November 1944) by the Committee on Work Among Moslems. 156 Fifth Ave., New York 10, N.Y.

* Out of print, but obtainable in large libraries.